

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

PIN: 6462
APPLICANT NAME: Ventura Countywide Integrated Regional Water Management
PROJECT TITLE: Ventura Countywide Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation
FUNDS REQUESTED: \$ 25,338,199
COST MATCH: \$ 78,466,929
TOTAL PROJECT COST: \$103,805,128

DESCRIPTION: The projects will 1) enhance water supply reliability by distributing recycled water and recharging groundwater basins, implementing conjunctive use of surface flows and groundwater, and improving emergency supply infrastructure; 2) improve water quality by eliminating pollution from septic tanks, domestic water softeners, agricultural runoff, and urban wastewater; relocating at-risk sewer lines out of riverbeds; and upgrading water treatment facilities; 3) protecting ecosystems by restoring and expanding riparian and wetland habitats, creating fish passages, and protecting water supplies needed for steelhead trout; 4) manage floodwaters by acquiring flood-prone properties, and controlling permitted uses in floodplains; and 5) Improve watershed planning by preparing watershed management plans.

Question: Consistency with Minimum IRWM Standards - This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated that the IRWM Plan meets the minimum standards.

Pass

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Adopted IRWM Plan and Proof of Formal Adoption. Weighting factor is 1. 2

The applicant has not completed an IRWMP, but has submitted an Interim Ventura Countywide IRWM Plan and a schedule detailing the preparation and adoption of an IRWMP by Dec. 2006.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Description of Region. Weighting factor is 1. 4

The Interim IRWMP describes the southwestern portion of Ventura County as the region. It includes a detailed map showing appropriate internal boundaries, major water related infrastructure, and land use designations. The discussion of important ecological processes, environmental resources, social and cultural makeup, and economic trends is thorough. A detailed description of the quality and quantity of water resources and the 20 year planning horizon is needed. In addition, the information provided suggests there may be some overlap with regions defined in other applications such as PIN 6984, 7144, and 7084. Overlap with PIN 6984 has resulted in correspondence between the 2 agencies to determine how they may work together. More detail on review findings regarding this coordination is included under additional comments and other comments.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Objectives. Weighting factor is 1. 4

The proposal includes a detailed matrix comparing all projects identified to the goals and objectives of the IRWMP. The applicant also discusses how they were gathered and compiled with input over a 6-month period from stakeholders region-wide. This input was used to create a countywide multi-watershed IRWMP, addressing statewide priorities. More discussion on conflicts and apparent lack of coordination in regions with overlapping boundaries is needed.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Water Management Strategies and Integration. Weighting factor is 1. 5

The IRWMP addresses the range of water management strategies, and thoroughly discusses how the strategies work together in their region. It also includes a discussion of added benefits from these synergies, and a short and long-term priority list for the implementation projects.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Priorities and Schedule. Weighting factor is 1. 3

An extensive list of projects is included in the proposal, however only some are prioritized and a schedule for implementation is not provided. Two separate priority lists were presented and they may need to be combined for consideration if invited for Step 2. More discussion is needed regarding responsiveness of decision making to regional changes, responses to implementation of projects will be assessed, and project sequencing may be altered based on implementation responses.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Implementation. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The interim IRWMP proposes an institutional structure for final development and implementation of the IRWMP. A timeline is included and the entities responsible for project implementation are discussed, but to some extent this is speculation on how the program may proceed. To the extent feasible given the interim status of the plan, linkages were identified. Technical feasibility studies and plans were provided including those for the listed projects. A discussion specifically addressing economic feasibility of each and/or all projects in the proposal is needed.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Impacts and Regional Benefits. Weighting factor is 1.

2

The IRWMP discusses the advantages of the integrated plan and interregional benefits. The applicant states that the primary benefit of the IRWMP is regional cooperation; however, the applicant does not have cooperation from Callaguas Creek WS and the Upper Santa Clara River WS. The project focuses on the Ventura River and Lower SCR watersheds. Cost-sharing and regional planning are stated as regional benefits, however, the CCWS within the applicants' Region already has an adopted IRWMP and is ready to proceed with implementation. Any potential negative impacts as a result of implementation are not discussed, but CEQA will be initiated for the IRWMP and its projects. No benefits to DACs are discussed, as the Region does not have any DACs.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Technical Analysis and Plan Performance. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The Proposal indicates a strategy for monitoring the performance of the IRWMP will be identified as part of the final IRWMP and not included with the proposal. The proposal discusses regional meetings to identify what data exists, data gaps, and formats that can be used. It appears some areas are over studied and others are not studied adequately. The applicant is striving to achieve a more balanced allocation of resources to obtain the necessary data. This includes doing a detailed review of studies to define groundwater basin yield in both major watersheds identified as the region.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Data Management. Weighting factor is 1.

4

The IRWMP assessed the state of existing monitoring efforts for both water supply and management. The applicant included mechanisms by which data will be managed and disseminated to the public. A system is already in place to share data region-wide, however, the data format varies. The applicant is working on data protocols to ensure that information is collected and organized in formats to be compatible with State and federal needs, but there is no specific mention of SWAMP and GAMA. More discussion on meeting these statewide needs should be provided.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Financing. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The proposal identifies beneficiaries and provides a list of potential funding sources. The potential beneficiaries of IRWMP funding are those who have joined the Ventura IRWMP Group. The list of potential funding sources include district general funds, system replacement reserve funds, and funds from Cities, organizations, County departments but more information is needed on the specifics of financing, etc. More detail is also needed on support and financing for O&M of projects.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Relation to Local Planning & Sustainability. Weighting factor is 1.

4

The IRWMP Plan included and demonstrated coordination with local land-use planning decision-makers. The applicant states that all relevant plans will be incorporated into the IRWMP, but a stronger connection between specific IRWMP and its identified strategies and the various local planning programs is needed.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Stakeholder Involvement & Coordination. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The applicant discusses partnerships developed during the planning process and indirectly addresses environmental justice concerns. The applicant discusses disadvantaged communities within the Region and areas where a State agency may be able to assist communication or cooperation. A better discussion of true partnerships within the County should be presented, and entities not benefiting from the IRWMP should be identified. More effort is also needed to involve stakeholders in overlapping regions, including those working on separate proposals (PIN6984), so enhanced regional coordination can be achieved.

Question: Funding Match. This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated the ability to meet the minimum funding match or has requested a waiver or reduction in the funding match.

Pass

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

Question: Description of Proposal. Weighting factor is 3.

15

The proposal includes a detailed description of projects and addressed one or more of the water quality management elements. The goals and objectives of the proposal are identified. The application discusses how the proposal is consistent with the IRWMP and objectives. The rationale for the proposal is sufficient to understand the relationship to the Interim IRWM Plan. The proposal includes a plan for applicable environmental review. The proposal affecting water quality includes a description of the water body, a discussion of water quality problems, and a description of how the proposals are consistent with applicable TMDLs and Watershed Management Initiative Chapters, plans and policies, including TMDLs. The proposal includes a discussion of the integration with other grant funded projects in the region. For specific projects, there is discussion on how the project will be monitored/evaluated after construction to see if it is meeting its objectives.

Question: Project Prioritization. Weighting factor is 2.

6

Each of the projects within the two focus watersheds, the Ventura River and Lower Santa Clara River, are clearly prioritized, but the priority lists are not integrated. Each project correlates with the Interim IRWMP and a thorough description of projects is included. The proposal includes a clear distinction among the 140 or so projects that were tentatively proposed in the interim IRWMP. However, projects are prioritized by watershed within the region but not within the proposal itself. The proposal should have a single region-wide list of priorities.

Question: Cost Estimate. Weighting factor is 1.

5

The cost estimate is detailed for each of the 16 proposed projects and the costs appear to be reasonable. The cost estimate spreadsheet follows the format recommended in the Guidelines and is thorough and concise. Sources of funds for the funding match are provided for each project. Proposal addressed the questions in this criterion, but need more detailed estimates in next round if invited back to Step 2 of the process.

Question: Schedule. Weighting factor is 1.

5

The applicant provided detailed schedules showing the sequence and timing of the implementation of the proposal and demonstrated how related elements of the IRWM plan will be completed on schedule. The schedule was integrated showing how each project fit within the Proposal.

Question: Need. Weighting factor is 2.

4

The proposal includes a general description of need for each project, but does not fully describe the current water management systems that the proposed projects would replace or augment. A discussion of how each project meets the need for the region is also provided, however, more detail on fiscal, economic, and environmental impacts is needed. In addition, an analysis of negative impacts from not implementing the proposal should also be provided.

Question: Disadvantaged Communities. Weighting factor is 2.

8

The proposal demonstrates there are several projects that will provide direct benefits to DAC's in the two watersheds focused on in the region. These include the communities of Piru and El Rio where improved sanitary water supply facilities are proposed. There is also discussion of the DAC population in the region compared to the total population but no quantitative analysis. The applicant is not requesting a funding waiver.

Question: Program Preferences. Weighting factor is 1.

4

The proposal provides a well supported explanation of how the projects satisfy the program preferences. It also includes a useful chart showing each project and which program preference it addresses. More detail is needed on how they meet the program preferences.

TOTAL SCORE: 87
